



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,095	08/24/2001	Jeff A. Parks	10005499	5740

7590                    09/08/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/939,095	PARKS ET AL. 
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	CESAR B PAULA	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_ .

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>8/31/04</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDS filed on 8/24/2001

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 10, 13, and 17 are independent claims.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/22/2000 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 8/24/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 17 recites the limitation "the request template", and "the response template" in lines 5, and 11 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous "request template" to refer to in this claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

9. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bernardo et al, hereinafter Bernardo (Pat.# 6,684,369 B1, 1/27/2004, filed on 6/19/1998)

Regarding independent claim 17, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view received from a tool, indicating options to be included in the web page (col.7, lines 7-67, fig.4-6). In this case, the system doesn't know what kind of website is to be created,

whether a brand new or just the editing of an old website—*screen to be displayed to the user is unknown before runtime.*

Moreover, Bernardo discloses that as a result of the screen selection, a tool identifies which templates in a library—*request index template*-- are associated with the options selected by a user of the view. Another view is presented for requesting data—*request template*--needed for the web page in a website (col.7, lines 49-67).

Moreover, Bernardo discloses that when the user is done inputting information into the request screen, then a signal is sent to indicate the desire to complete building the web page, and submitting the request to a database—*preparing a screen request query, and submitting the screen request query to a business rules object and database* (col.7, lines 49-col.8, line 27).

Furthermore, Bernardo discloses the population of template fields in response to the request submission. The templates, from the database, are matched with the submitted data and then assembled accordingly (col.8, lines 1-27). In other words, when the input screen and data are received by the server, the appropriate templates identified, and then the web page is assembled with the templates and the received data—*returning, identifying, and assembling*.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 17, Bernardo discloses the assembled webpage is then revised—*displayed*-- by a number of authorized users (col.8, lines 1-27).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 17, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view, by communicating with a tool, located in a server (col.7, lines 49-col.8, line 27).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruck (Pat.# 6,268,856 B1, 7/31/2001), in view of Mighdoll (Pat.# 6,662,218 B2, 12/9/2003, continuation filed on 6/29/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Bruck discloses the downloading of web documents—*application screen*—from servers to a browser application. Parameters outlining the rules for displaying transitional content are included in the document—*business rule objects* (col.7, lines 39-col.8, line 30, and col.. 9, lines 7-col.10, line20).

Furthermore, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc.—*presentation object requested from* server storing the object— as determined by publishers are downloaded before the web document are being requested web content—*the application screen can be different than the one requested and displaying the application screen using the presentation object* (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67).

Art Unit: 2178

Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *a database*. However, Mighdoll teaches the retrieval of a web page document from a database storing the document (col.6, lines 7-37). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc.—*presentation object requested from server* storing the object-- as determined by publishers are downloaded before the web document are being requested web content—the application screen can be different than the one requested and displaying the application screen using the presentation object (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *identifying the application screen using a response table that contains display library*.. However, Mighdoll teaches the database storing a list of images being referenced by the document, and their locations-- *a response table that contains display library* of referenced images—for the retrieval of a web page document from the database (col.12, lines 51-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc.—*presentation object requested*

Art Unit: 2178

*from* server storing the object-- as determined by publishers are downloaded before the web document are being requested web content—*the application screen can be different than the one requested and displaying the application screen using the presentation object* (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *formatting the application screen returned for display using the display library returned from the response table*. However, Mighdoll teaches the database storing a list of images being referenced by the document, and their locations-- *a response table that contains display library* of referenced images—for the retrieval of a web page document from the database (col.12, lines 51-67). In other words, the database stores a list of the images to be inserted or formatted into the web page document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc. formatted using markup languages, such as HTML (col. 7, lines 7-17, and col.8, lines 39-67).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Bruck teaches a browser—*interpreter to identify application screen*-- for the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc. formatted using markup languages, such as HTML (col. 7, lines 7-17, and col.8, lines 39-67).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc.—*presentation object requested from server* storing the object-- as determined by publishers are downloaded before the web document are being requested web content—the *application screen can be different than the one requested and displaying the application screen using the presentation object* (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *linking the presentation object and the database and business rule object, via a request and response table*. However, Mighdoll teaches the database storing a list of images being referenced by the document requested by the transitional rules, thus logically *linking the presentation object and the database and business rule object, via a database list or request and response table* (col.12, lines 51-67). In other words, the database stores a list of the images to be inserted or formatted into the web page document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Regarding independent claim 7, Bruck discloses the downloading or requesting of web documents—*user screen*—from servers to a browser application—*presentation object* (col.7, lines 39-col.8, line 30, and col.. 9, lines 7-col.10, line20).

Moreover, Bruck teaches the download of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc., are downloaded—*received back* from a server-- before the

web document are being requested web content—*the user screen can be a different user screen than the one requested* (col. 7, lines 7-17, 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *a database and business rules object*. However, Mighdoll teaches the retrieval of a web page document from a database-- *database and business rules object*-- storing the document (col.6, lines 7-37). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Furthermore, the display, according to a markup language format, such as HTML,—*identifying and formatting the user screen response for display*-- of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc.,—*received back from a server*-- before the web document are being requested web content (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc., (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *identifying the user screen using a response table that contains display formatting components*. However, Mighdoll teaches the database storing a list of images being referenced by the document, and their locations-- *a response table that contains display formatting components* of referenced images—for the retrieval of a web page document from the database (col.12, lines 51-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because

Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Bruck teaches the display of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc., (col. 7, lines 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *formatting the user screen response returned for display using the display formatting components returned from the response table*. However, Mighdoll teaches the database storing a list of images being referenced by, and to be formatted and displayed in, the document, and their locations for the retrieval of a web page document from the database (col.12, lines 51-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents (col.12, lines 57-67).

Regarding independent claim 10, Bruck discloses the downloading or requesting of web documents, which include image, video, audio, etc.,—*user screen and data*—from servers to a browser application—*presentation object* (col.7, lines 39-col.8, line 30, and col.. 9, lines 7-col.10, line20).

Moreover, Bruck teaches the browser for requesting, by clicking on a link, the download of transitional documents or content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc., are downloaded (col. 7, lines 7-17, 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67). Bruck fails to explicitly disclose: *a database and business rules object and a response table to translate a response user screen from the*

Art Unit: 2178

*database and business rules object and to provide display properties for the response user screen when a different user screen is returned.* Mighdoll teaches a database storing a list of images being referenced by the document, and their locations-- *a response table that contains display library* of referenced images—for the retrieval of a web page document from the database (col.12, lines 51-67). In other words, the database stores a list of the images to be translated or formatted into the web page document upon request of the document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bruck, and Mighdoll, because Mighdoll teaches improving speed with which web documents are downloaded using the database for the storage of the documents, which are formatted according the markup language—*display properties* (col.12, lines 57-67).

Furthermore, the display, according to a markup language format, such as HTML,—*formatting the user screen and combine it with requested data*-- of transitional documents and its content, such as time, date, local weather, ads, etc., before the web document are being requested web content (col. 7, lines 17-17, 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Bruck discloses the downloading or requesting of web documents, which include image, video, audio, etc.,—*user screen and data*—from servers to a browser application—*presentation object* (col.7, lines 39-col.8, line 30, and col.. 9, lines 7-col.10, line20, fig.5).

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 10, the display, according to a markup language format, such as HTML of transitional documents and its content, such as time, date,

local weather, ads, etc., before the web document are being requested web content (col. 7, lines 17-17, 50-67, and col.8, lines 39-67).

12. Claims 13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo, in view of Marcos (Pat.# 6,262,729 B1, 7/17/2001).

Regarding independent claim 13, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view, indicating options to be included in the web page (col.7, lines 7-48, fig.4-6). In this case, the system doesn't know what kind of website is to be created, whether a brand new or just the editing of an old website—*screen to be displayed to the user is unknown before runtime*.

Moreover, Bernardo discloses that as a result of the screen selection, a tool identifies which templates in a library—*request index template*-- are associated with the options selected by a user of the view. Another view is presented for requesting data—*request template*--needed for the web page in a website (col.7, lines 49-67).

Moreover, Bernardo discloses that when the user is done inputting information into the request screen, then a signal is sent to indicate the desire to complete building the web page, and submitting the request to tool—*request handler coupled to the request index template*, and a database—*preparing a screen request query, and submitting the screen request query to a business rules object and database* (col.7, lines 49-col.8, line 27).

Furthermore, Bernardo discloses the population of template fields in response to the request submission. The templates are matched with the submitted data and then assembled accordingly (col.8, lines 1-27). In other words, when the input screen and data are received by

the server, the appropriate templates identified, and then the web page is assembled with the templates and the received data—*template assembler to assemble*. Bernardo fails to explicitly disclose: *a request table and a response table*. Marcos teaches the binding of fields in a database table to elements in a web page (col.15, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bernardo, and Marcos, because Marcos teaches making it easier to create Internet applications.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 13, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view, indicating options to be included in the web page (col.7, lines 7-48, fig.4-6).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view, by communicating with a template library, a database, a tool, an assembler located in a server (col.7, lines 49-col.8, line 27).

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo, in view of Marcos, and further in view of Tomsen (USPub.# 2002/0013950 A1, 1/31/2002, filed on 12/1/2000).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view, by communicating with a template library, a database, a tool, an

assembler located in a server (col.7, lines 49-col.8, line 27, fig.6). Bernardo fails to explicitly disclose: *a caching template assembler...for data which will be stored in a template caching unit.* Tomsen teaches the storage of templates in a cache (0051). In other words, the database stores a list of the images to be translated or formatted into the web page document upon request of the document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bernardo, Marcos, and Tomsen, because this would provide the benefit of speeding up the retrieval of templates from the template library

14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo, in view of Tomsen (USPub.# 2002/0013950 A1, 1/31/2002, filed on 12/1/2000).

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 17, Bernardo discloses the creation of a web page using a screen view, by communicating with a template library, a database, a tool, an assembler located in a server (col.7, lines 49-col.8, line 27, fig.6). Bernardo fails to explicitly disclose: *caching the data from the second request.* Tomsen teaches the storage of templates in a cache (0051). In other words, the database stores a list of the images to be translated or formatted into the web page document upon request of the document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bernardo, Marcos, and Tomsen, because this would provide the benefit of speeding up the retrieval of templates from the template library

***Conclusion***

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Trusheim et al. (Pat. # 6,385,589), Judson (Pat. # 5,572,643), and Feldman et al. (Pat. # 2002/0198753).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5543 (571) 272-2148 as of 10/12/04**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (703) 308-5465 ((571) 272-4124 as of 10/12/04). However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)**

Art Unit: 2178

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**



CESAR B PAULA  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

9/7/04